

**REMARKS**

Claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13, 16, 22** and **23** were pending in this application.

Claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13, 16, 22** and **23** have been rejected.

Claims **1, 2, 4-5, 9-13** and **23** have been amended.

Claim **22** has been cancelled.

Claims **26-28** have been added.

Therefore, claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13, 16, 23** and **26-28** remain pending.

No new matter is added hereby. Support for the new claims and amendments can be found in the originally-filed specification, e.g., at ¶¶ [0019] and [0031] and Fig. 3, among others.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Hind et al., U.S. Patent 7,346,843 (“Hind”) in view of Datta, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128618 (“Datta”), and in further view of Fliess et al., U.S. Patent 7,168,045 (“Fliess”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hind, Datta, and Fliess, alone or in any rational combination, fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, including:

“...  
 if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available,  
 generating the requested display page, wherein  
 the requested display page comprises  
 the retrieved realtime information, and  
 the previously cached non-realtime information,  
 requesting re-generation of the non-realtime information, wherein  
 the requesting of the re-generation is performed subsequent to the  
 generating the requested display page, and  
 the re-generation of the non-realtime information produces re-generated  
 non-realtime information, and  
 caching the re-generated non-realtime information as cached re-generated  
 realtime information, wherein  
 the cached re-generated realtime information is configured to be used  
 when generating another instance of the requested display page in  
 response to a subsequent request for the requested display page;  
 and  
 ...”

Hind relates to techniques for incrementally rendering content in a content framework (such as a portal page provided by a portal system). *Hind*, Abstract. Hind teaches that upon receiving a request for a portal page, a portal server immediately returns a response including the results from portlets which have acquired their content. *Id.* If some portlets have not yet finished, subsequent content is delivered at a later time through use of one of several alternative programmatically-generated mechanisms. *Id.* The Office Action cites Hind at column 7, lines 63-67 as purportedly teaching “if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available, generating the requested display page comprising the retrieved realtime information and the previously cached non-realtime information.”

However, the cited portions of Hind merely disclose that, with relation to element 440 of Fig. 4, if a portlet is not ready, the portlet may use locally-cached content. *Hind*, col. 7:63-67. Even assuming *arguendo*, that the portlet of Hind could somehow be successfully characterized as operating in an analogous manner to that of the claimed process of, if a previously cached version of non-realtime information is available, generating the requested display page wherein the requested display page comprises the retrieved realtime information, and the previously cached non-realtime information (a view to which Applicants do not acquiesce), the portlet of Hind would still fail to request re-generation of the non-realtime information where the requesting of the re-generation is performed subsequent to the generating the requested display page, and caching the re-generated non-realtime information as cached re-generated realtime information, where the cached re-generated realtime information is configured to be used when generating another instance of the requested display page in response to a subsequent request for the requested display page. Moreover, Hind would further fail to do so based on whether a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available. Instead, Hind (at best) discloses only that portlets may use locally-cached content, without specifying any additional details. Therefore Hind does not, and cannot, teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1, among others.

Datta does not remedy the deficiencies of Hind. Datta is related to a preloader mechanism for faster web page delivery as well as dynamic web page delivery. *Datta*, Abstract. In Fig. 9, Datta discloses a technique for generating a dynamic web page. *Datta*, Fig. 9. Datta discloses determining if a page request for a web page has any remaining content elements that

have not been supplied. *Datta*, [0093], element 903 of Fig. 9. If there is remaining content, Datta teaches determining whether content element is found in component cache. *Datta*, [0094], element 904 of Fig. 9. Datta teaches to generate the content element if there is no element found in the cache. *Datta*, [0093], element 912 of Fig. 9. Datta teaches to place content in the buffer and to proceed with delivering the web page if the content is found in the cache. *Datta*, [0093], elements 906-910 of Fig. 9.

However, it is very clear that Datta does not teach or suggest requesting, if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available, re-generation of non-realtime information where the requesting of the re-generation is performed subsequent to the generating the requested display page that comprises the retrieved realtime information and the previously cached non-realtime information. Further, Datta is completely silent as to the claimed caching the re-generated non-realtime information as cached re-generated realtime information, where the cached re-generated realtime information is configured to be used when generating another instance of the requested display page in response to a subsequent request for the requested display page. To the contrary, Datta teaches only that a content element may be generated (i.e., in step 912 of Fig. 9) if content element is not found in the component cache (i.e., in the determination of step 904). Put another way, Datta clearly teaches that if the content element is found (i.e., in steps 904 and 906), the content element is not generated. Notwithstanding the many distinctions between the claimed elements and features of Datta involved in their respective processes, the processes disclosed in Datta, taken alone or in permissible combination with those of Hind (which also fails to teach these features), also fails to show, teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of claim 1.

Turning now to Fliess, a modeling process is described that consists of translating business objects into features of graphic objects. *Fliess*, 2:24-30. Fliess further provides that a view page generated for a user provides a comprehensive overview of all business objects by displaying the business objects as graphic objects. *Fliess*, 8:33-41. However, Fliess is not concerned with caching. Thus, alone or in any rational combination with Hind and/or Datta (which also fail to teach these features, as noted), the addition of Fliess to such a combination does not remedy such deficiencies and would result in a combination of references that (were such a combination even appropriate) would still fail to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

In this regard, Applicants note that in a rejection of a similar element of the now-cancelled dependent claim 22, the Office Action on page 7 alleges that “refreshing a display screen for the purpose of updating the status of a currently displayed web page is notoriously well known in the art,” in addition to giving a reason for rejection as “rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1.” However, the noted portions of amended claim 1 are directed to requesting, if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available, re-generation of the non-realtime information, where the requesting of the re-generation is performed subsequent to the generating the requested display page, and caching the re-generated non-realtime information as cached re-generated realtime information, where the cached re-generated realtime information is configured to be used when generating another instance of the requested display page in response to a subsequent request for the requested display page. As these limitations make abundantly clear, the claimed invention is not simply directed to “refreshing a display screen for the purpose of updating the status of a currently displayed web page,” and in so doing, reciting limitations that are somehow “notoriously well known in the art,” as alleged by the Office Action.

Furthermore, any rational application of the references used in the rejection of claim 1 (whether used as suggested by the Office Action, or in any other fashion), clearly demonstrates that any such combination of Hind, Datta, and/or Fliess does not teach or suggest the noted claim elements. As argued above, Datta clearly teaches away from requesting, if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available, re-generation of the non-realtime information subsequent to generating the requested display page. Datta also clearly fails to show, teach or suggest caching, particularly as to the claimed determination of whether a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available, and the resulting re-generation of non-realtime information, where the cached re-generated realtime information is configured to be used when generating another instance of the requested display page in response to a subsequent request for the requested display page, as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that if such features are “notoriously well known in the art,” then it can be assumed that Datta, the cited reference, reflects someone who is well skilled in the art (e.g., reflective of a person with ordinary skill in the art). However, instead of teaching the foregoing limitations of claim 1, Datta clearly teaches away from and/or fails to teach features in any way comparable to those limitations, among others. Furthermore, none of the cited references, taken singly or in any rational combination, teach or suggest these claim elements either. Applicants

therefore respectfully disagree with the allegations that the claim limitations in question, and in fact, any of the recited limitations, are well known in the art.

In summary, since the combination of Hind, Datta, and Fliess does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, the combination of Hind, Datta, and Fliess cannot render claim 1 obvious. Furthermore, independent claims 9 and 23 are patentable over Hind, Datta, and Fliess for similar reasons to independent claim 1, and further in view of their own features. Still further, claims 2, 4, 5, and 8, which depend from independent claim 1, claims 10-13 and 16, which depend from independent claim 9, are patentable over Hind, Datta, and Fliess for at least the reasons provided for their respective base independent claims, and further in view of their own features. Claim 22 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New claims 26-28

Claims 26-28 are added herein. New claim 26 is dependent on independent claim 1. New claim 27 is dependent on independent claim 9. New claim 28 is dependent on independent claim 23. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are allowable at least for the reasons stated for their respective independent claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 42,381  
Telephone: (512) 439-5084  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099